

REMARKS

Claims 68, 70, 72, 74, 77, and 80 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 68-82 remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 68-82 on non-statutory double patenting grounds, as well as under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. §102(e), based on Gayraud and/or Rakavy, as applicable.

The terminal disclaimer filed concurrently herewith is believed to overcome the non-statutory double patenting rejection.

The claims have been amended to remove the “and/or” formulation on which the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph were based. As such, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is believed to have been overcome.

The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 68, Gayraud teaches providing in a window on the periphery of the user area of a display textual “hints” of the function associated with toolbar and other icons displayed on the display. Gayraud at 3:20-4:5 & Figures 3A-D and associated text. Rakavy teaches transmitting and displaying advertising content by employing a local agent to download and display advertisements, with the content being determined by user-indicated preferences and configuration information. Rakavy at 2:60-3:63, 5:30-6:30, 9:15-10:41. Claim 68 has been amended to recite “wherein the one or more sets of content data are selected from a plurality of sets of content data, each set being provided by an associated content provider, and wherein for each set the respective content provider may provide scheduling instructions tailored to the set of content data to control the duration, sequencing, and/or timing of the display of the set of content

data". Neither Gayraud nor Rakavy teaches such tailored control by a content provider of the duration, sequencing, and/or timing of the display of a set of content data. As such, claim 68 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 69 depends from claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 70 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 71 depends from claim 70 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 72 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 73 depends from claim 72 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 74 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 75-76 depend from claim 74 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 77 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 78-79 depend from claim 77 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 80 has been amended similarly to claim 68 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 81-82 depend from claim 80 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment with additions underlined and deletions struck through. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 650 903 3502
F 650 903 3501

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
4906 El Camino Real, Suite 205
Los Altos, CA 94022